



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/813,075	03/20/2001	Edward F. Chamberlain	6032/093	1665
36122	7590	11/14/2008	EXAMINER	
THE OLLILA LAW GROUP LLC			DINH, TIEN QUANG	
2060 BROADWAY				
SUITE 300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOULDER, CO 80302			3644	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/813,075	CHAMBERLAIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tien Dinh	3644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 February 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 9-13 and 21-35 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 9-13, 21-35 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9, 10, 12, 13, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eyre et al in view of Trecker 4034518 and possibly the admitted prior art on page 4 of the disclosure.

Eyre et al teaches a method of inflating and launching a balloon. The steps include deploying a launch platform 11 where the balloon can be inflated and be protected with a launch bag 13. The balloon is controllably released from the launch bag via elements 33, 57, etc. See figures 3-6. The launch bag 13 is secured to the platform with element 63, 61, 47. Where ever the balloon is about to be launched is clearly its launch site. Eyre et al is silent on the steps of opening a cover on a case and extending the panel from the case. However, Trecker teaches the steps of using a carrying case that opens a cover 12 and extends panels 51, 23, 24 to provide a launch platform on which an uninflated balloon can be placed. The inside of the case can be used to store and transport the uninflated balloon.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a portable carrying system to replace Eyre et al's launch platform to have the predictable result of easier storage and portability.

Re claim 10, please note that balloons or balloon systems can come in various sizes. A person skilled in the art would have made the balloons any sizes necessary to achieve the desired

mission and at the same time save space and weight. A person skilled in the art would have used the balloons and launch system that is small enough to be carried by Bernier so that the balloon system can be fitted inside the case and can be carried around.

Re claim 12, please note that Eyre et al teaches that the canopy 13 is made out of “light weight fabric”. A person skilled in the art would recognize that fabrics are elastic, which is defined as being able to returning to its original shape after being expanded, etc. Furthermore, elastic materials that applicant has admitted as prior art such as Lycra are well known. One skilled in the art would have used Lycra as the material in the launch bag as a mere substitution of parts. Applicant has not cited any criticality to the material. Please note that fabrics such as cotton used to make t-shirts are “elastic”. One skilled in the art should recognize this notoriously well known fact.

RE claim 25, there are two panels that provide launch platforms as readily seen in figures 1 and 4 of Trecker.

Re claim 26, please note that applicant has not provided any criticality for this. In addition, since the size of the balloons can be small, the balloons hence will be less than the length of the panels. Plus, there is no step in this claim. The applicant is merely trying to claim an apparatus and not a step.

Claims 22-24, 32, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eyre et al as modified by Trecker 4034518 as applied to claims 9 and 27 above, and further in view of Burns 6286462.

Eyre et al as modified by Trecker 4034518 discloses all claimed parts (including handle 31) except for the wheel and fittings. However, Burns discloses wheels (see figure 5) and fittings 34 are well known.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used wheels and fittings in Erye et al's system as modified by Trecker and as taught by Burns to have the predictable result of easier transportation and to allow the system to be secured to any structure.

Claims 11, 21, 29, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erye et al as modified by Trecker 4034518 as applied to claims 9 and 27 above, and further in view of Bernier 3915529.

Eyre et al as modified by Trecker 4034518 discloses all claimed parts except for the extending the legs that are opposite the cover and can be extended prior to opening the case. Bernier discloses extending legs 35 that are opposite the cover and can be extended prior to opening the case. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided legs opposite the cover and that can be extended prior to opening the case in Erye et al's system as modified by Trrecker and as taught by Bernier to have the suit case be at a higher level prior to opening up the case for easier reach.

Response to Arguments

The examiner has used Trecker to reject the claims. The new rejections above renders applicant's arguments moot.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The rejection was made final due to the amendment on 9/10/07 and 1/14/08.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tien Dinh whose telephone number is 571-272-6899. The examiner can normally be reached on 12-8.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Mansen can be reached on 571-272-6608. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tien Dinh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3644